



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,634	01/15/2004	Earl D. Webb	HES 2000-IP-001080US1D2	6116
28857	7590	11/23/2004	EXAMINER BOMAR, THOMAS S	
CRAIG W. RODDY HALLIBURTON ENERGY SERVICES P.O. BOX 1431 DUNCAN, OK 73536-0440			ART UNIT 3672	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/758,634

Applicant(s)

WEBB ET AL.

Examiner

Shane Bomar

Art Unit

3672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8,9 and 13-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10-12, 17 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some.* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 8, 9, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent 5,234,052 to Coone et al.

Regarding claims 8 and 15, Coone et al discloses an apparatus for limiting rotation of a cementing plug 33 that comprises an outer housing 10, and an inner sleeve 22 disposed in the housing 10 for engaging the plug 33 to limit rotation during drillout (see Figs. 2 and 3; col. 2, lines 18-22; col. 3, lines 11-18; col. 4, lines 6-15), the inner sleeve 22 defining a passageway for receiving the plug 33 so that the plug 33 engages an inner surface of the sleeve 22 wherein only a portion of an outer inherently expandable profile of the sleeve 22 contacts an inner surface of the housing (see Figs. 2 and 3). The sleeve 22 is considered to have an outer inherently expandable profile because the sleeve is elastomeric, which is well known in the art as an expandable material.

Regarding claims 9 and 16, the outer profile is defined by a generally cylindrical outer surface with a plurality of grooves in between the fins 23 (see Fig. 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coone et al in view of US patent 6,056,053 to Giroux et al.

Art Unit: 3672

Baker et al teach the apparatus of claim 8 that comprises an inner sleeve. It is not expressly taught that the inner sleeve is made of a composite or plastic material.

Giroux et al teaches an apparatus similar to that of Baker et al. It is further taught that a sleeve for a cementing plug system could be made of a composite or plastic material (see col. 19, lines 1-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Baker et al and Giroux et al before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the sleeve taught by Baker et al to include the composite or plastic material of Giroux et al, in order to obtain an easily drillable sleeve. One would have been motivated to make such a combination since Giroux et al have shown it to be notoriously known in the cementing plug art to make any of the components out of this material.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1-7 are allowed.
5. Claims 10-12, 17, and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments, see page 5, filed 10/4/04, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 8 and 15 under 35 USC 102(b) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Coone et al.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shane Bomar whose telephone number is 703-305-4849. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 7:00am to 4:30pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bagnell can be reached on 703-308-2151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Art Unit: 3672

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



David J. Bagnell
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3672

tsb



November 15, 2004